

NOTES ON EARLY GREEK GRAVE EPIGRAMS

M. B. WALLACE

THE EARLY GREEK grave epigrams are brief, individual social and literary documents, full both of problems and of interest. Dr Pfohl's recent collection makes it easy to study them as a group, and prompts questions about their composition.¹

As a preliminary, we should exclude texts which lack any clear poetic colour or metrical scheme.² Pfohl 169 may serve as an example: Οἱμοὶ ὀρχέδα|με ἡο Πυθέα Σε|λινόντιος (Delphi, ca. 525–500 B.C.). Kirchhoff took the line as iambic, Wilamowitz approved his view, and later scholars have accepted it;³ see, for instance, *Epigrammata*, p. 161: "Crude trimeter, the approximation to dochmiacs being accidental." Whatever may be thought of this analysis in isolation, its consequences proved unfortunate.

In 1899 Orsi published the following text: Οἱ[μοι]| 'Επαλύ[?]ο τῷ Σάν|ρο (Hybla Heraia, later sixth century). In 1925 Keramopoulos published Οἱμοὶ Πεδιάρχο| τῷ Ενπεδιῶνος| Πεδιάρχος ἄρχει τῷ(ν) σ|εμάτῳν (Attica, ca. 540). Werner Peek proposed to scan its first two lines as two reiziana, and it appears in Pfohl's collection, as 57. In 1961 J. B. Marconi published Οἱμοὶ ὁ Εὐρυφῶν ἡο 'Αρχινίδα (Selinous, later fifth century). Pfohl does not include it, but W. M. Calder III considers it an iambic verse, though admitting that the approximation to a "brachycatalectic iambic trimeter" is probably accidental.⁴ As Archedamos and

¹This paper owes much to discussions with my late father, W. P. Wallace; among many other kindnesses M. E. White and L. E. Woodbury have criticized drafts of it. The following abbreviations are used: Pfohl = G. Pfohl, *Greek Poems on Stone*, 1: *Epitaphs from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries B.C.* (Textus Minores 36, Leyden 1967); *Epigrammata* = P. Friedlaender and H. B. Hoffleit, *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse from the Beginnings to the Persian War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1948); GV = W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, 1: *Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin 1955); Boardman = J. Boardman, "Painted Funerary Plaques and Some Remarks on Prothesis," *BSA* 50 (1955) 51–66; Gentili = B. Gentili, "Epigramma ed elegia," *L'Epigramme Grecque (Entretiens Hardt 14, Geneva 1968)* 37–90; Miss Guarducci = M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca* 1 (Rome 1967); Miss Jeffery = L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961); Miss Jeffery, *BSA* 57 = L. H. Jeffery, "The Inscribed Gravestones of Archaic Attica," *BSA* 57 (1962) 115–153; Karousos = C. Karousos, *Aristodikos* (Stuttgart 1961); Raubitschek = A. E. Raubitschek, "Das Denkmal-Epigramm," *L'Epigramme Grecque (Entretiens 14, Fondation Hardt, Geneva 1968)* 1–36.

²See Additional Note at end.

³See Kirchhoff *ap.* Pomtow, *SBBerl* (1887) 708 n. 1; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Griechische Verskunst* (Berlin 1921) 291, with n. 5.

⁴See P. Orsi, "Ragusa—Nuove esplorazioni nelle necropoli di Hybla Heraia," *NSc*

Euryphon were both from Selinous, and Pediarchos had a non-Attic name found at Selinous, Calder deduces the continued local existence of an iambic form of lament that was made the basis of sepulchral epigrams. The conclusion would be the more interesting as otherwise there are very few archaic iambic epitaphs known, and no archaic grave epigrams at all from any part of Magna Graecia.

Yet Jean Bousquet is surely right that none of the texts is metrical. Calder admits that the Euryphon inscription ends in a cretic after two iambic metra with three hiatuses, though the two names each separately fit iambic rhythm, had the author wished to produce it. Moreover, the Italian excavations at Selinous have recently turned up nine early grave stones with *οἱμοι* and the bare biographical facts.⁵ None fits any normal metrical pattern or (with one exception) corresponds syllabically with any other, or with any of the four above. The local tradition was not a verse tradition, and we are not dealing with grave epigrams.⁶

The *οἱμοι* question, if it may be called that, raises the general issue of local fashions in epitaphs. Conservatism in funerary matters certainly produced such things, both through oral tradition and through the influence of tombstones in the area. Louis Robert, especially, has called attention to a host of peculiarities of language, or phrasing, or thought, that have clear regional boundaries. Even verse epitaphs sometimes show signs of local influence, though the small percentage of mourners who chose to write or commission poems naturally produced texts more literary and less local in style. In our period, however, the similarities

(1899) 402–418, 411, with improvements by Miss Jeffery, 269.21, A. Keramopoulos, *Φιλοσοφική Σχολή τοῦ Ἀθηνῶν Πανεπιστημίου* (1926) 59 (*non vidi*; cf. P. Roussel, "Bulletin Epigraphique," *REG* 39 [1926] 265), W. Peek, "Attische Inschriften," *AthMitt* 67 (1942, appeared 1951) 1–217, p. 88.142, J. B. Marconi, "Epigrafe Funeraria Selinuntia," *Kokalos* 7 (1961) 109–112, W. M. Calder III, "A New Verse Inscription from Selinus," *AJA* 69 (1965) 262–264. J. B. Bousquet, "Archedamos de Selinonte," *BCH* 88 (1964) 380–382, and H. R. Immerwahr, "An Inscribed Terracotta Ball in Boston," *GRBS* 8 (1967) 255–266, 258, n. 9, follow Miss Jeffery, *BSA* 57, no. 54 in restoring Pfohl 68 *οἱμοι θανόντες ἐμὶ| [σε]μα Μυρινῆς* instead of the usual *λοι|μῶι. οἱμοι* also appears on an Attic clay funerary plaque, Boardman 28. Neither seems to affect the argument.

⁵See *Kokalos* 9 (1963) 137–156.2, 5, 8, Revisioni 2, 3; 10/11 (1964/5) 481; 12 (1966) 179–199.1, 3, 4, 7, 200–206.2; 13 (1967) 194–201 a 1, Miss Guarducci 320–321.

⁶Of the thirteen texts involved only *οἱμοι ὁ Γόργε* and *οἱμοι ὁ Ὑφι* make a possible pair. An anonymous reader considers Ὀρχέδαμε in Pfohl 169 a sign of verse composition, but similar contractions are common in non-metrical archaic inscriptions—cf. among others Miss Jeffery, Transliteration of Plates 3.25; 9.18; 16.4, 13; 23.3, 8; 26.2, 7; 51.3; and especially 28.19: Ἀτῶρος : Ἀργεῖος | κάργειας : ἡγάλαιδα τάργειο. The vocative is paralleled by the texts at the beginning of this note. A slightly halting one-line iambic poem, if such had been desired, could easily have been achieved thus: *οἱμοι τάλας Ἀρχινίδα παῖς Εὐρυφόν.*

and repetitions of phrases do not generally seem to have a local basis, and the most striking case of resemblance is international—Pfohl 55 from Attica shares a line with 156 from Argos and almost a line with 137 from Thessaly.⁷

Something that was influenced by local notions of propriety, however, was the initial decision whether or not to have a verse epitaph. Central Greece was on the whole the home of the species. Of the one hundred and fifty-three inscribed epigrams surviving from the period before *ca.* 400 B.C., eighty-three are from Attica alone, though the proportion is doubtless swollen by the particular thoroughness with which Attica has been explored. Thirty-four more lie on or within a curve drawn through Argos, Delphi, Larissa, Eretria, and Aigina. Indeed the triangle of Korkyra, Amorgos, and Thasos roughly contains all the archaic examples known, with four exceptions, Pfohl 181, 182, and 186 (but cf. Gentili 61), and *Epigrammata* 33, from Erythrai, Teos, Abdera, and Rhodes. These facts should be borne in mind by those who, very naturally, propose to see a connection between the occurrence of early sepulchral poetry and the existence of local schools of oral epic. Not only the Greek West but especially the Greek East is strangely under-represented.

Figures given by locality may of course be misleading. Pfohl gives nine texts to Magna Graecia, for instance. Of these, three seem to be prose (166, 169, 172), and three are fifth-century (170, 173, 174). The last three are Aeschylus' epitaph, Simonides' memorial of the doctor Pausanias of Gela, and a literary couplet of uncertain date for some Selinuntine patriots. The true conclusion is that Magna Graecia had no native sepulchral poetry in the archaic period. To return to Central Greece, Pfohl has eleven Thessalian texts. The three preserved in the literary tradition stand out from the others. 138, attributed to Aeschylus, is the only poem in Pfohl's collection to refer to a personal Moira; 144, for the great doctor Hippokrates of Kos, is full of conceits; and 145, for Lykas, a hound, is the only epitaph on an animal. Finally, to create a heading *Thermopylai* for five literary epigrams from the battle of 480 seems a positively unreasonable extension of the local principle.

Let us move on to more intrinsic matters than place and date, or even kind of author and kind of victim. The five surviving texts from Corinth and her colony Korkyra *ca.* 650–*ca.* 550 may serve as an illustration. Pfohl 12 is a simple identifying statement: "The *stele* of Xenwares son

⁷For prose, see L. Robert, *Études Épigraphiques et Philologiques* (Paris 1938) 4: "Contributions à une lexique épigraphique"; for verse, L. Robert, *La Carie* 2 (Paris 1953) ch. 3, "Heraklée de la Salbaque," on no. 89, cf. 90–92, and W. P. and M. B. Wallace, "Two Grave Epigrams from Karystos," forthcoming in *Hesperia*, esp. nn. 10–13. The body of material surveyed here and throughout is that presented by Pfohl as emended by the *Additional Note* at the end of this paper.

of Mheixis I am upon his tomb," and 9, as usually restored, amplifies the form: "The stele of the mother of Simos I stand upon her tomb, of Polynowa; and grief for the mother was left behind to the son." The reiterated "mother" makes one think, however, of the commonest of all Greek sepulchral themes, that of untimely death, of children preceding their parents to the grave, and it is tempting to complete the broken lines: "Of the son, Simos, I stand upon the tomb, of the mother, Polynowa; and grief for the son was left behind to the mother."⁸ The remaining three epigrams certainly indicate a cause for special grief at the death and special ostentation in the burial of the deceased: 5, "Of Dweinias this is the monument, whom the shameless sea destroyed"; 11, "This is the monument of Arniadas, whom death-visaged Ares destroyed fighting by the ships at the streams of Araththos as he showed great valour in the sounding *mêlée*"; and, most elaborately, 10, "Of the son of Tlasias, Menekrates, this is the monument, an Oianthean by birth. And this the *Demos* made for him, for he was a *proxenos*, dear to the *Demos*, but he was destroyed in the sea, and a public (*δαμόσιον*) woe — — — . Praximenes, coming from his native land, made this tomb for him, his brother, along with the *Demos*." Death in youth, death in war, death at sea, death abroad—these are the only circumstances of death mentioned in Pfohl's collection.⁹ A verse epitaph, then, and its concomitants, a stone tomb and elegant decoration, tend to mark exceptional deaths.

In Menekrates' case the epitaph is only a small part of the commemoration. The six hexameters stretch in a single line around the outside of a large circular stone cenotaph some thirty feet in circumference. The *Demos* of Korkyra set out to honour its friend by a means which should be a permanent assertion of its own importance. I hope to discuss the epigram as a political propaganda document elsewhere, but here it may serve to remind one of the element of manifesto which is almost inseparable from sepulchral poems, or at least from that large majority of them that was inscribed on aristocratic monuments.

⁸For the theme, see E. Griessmair, *Das Motiv der Mors Immatura in den Griechischen Metrischen Grabinschriften* (*Commentationes Aenipontanae* 17, Innsbruck 1966). The restoration of Pfohl 9 proposed *exempli gratia* in the text would read:

[ἡνιοῦ Σ]ίμου ματρὸς ἐγὼ ἤεστακ' | ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
Πολυνόφας, σ[τοναχά] δ' ἡνιοῦ κατελείπετο ματρ[ί].

⁹Untimely death or burial by parent(s) is referred to in thirty-seven of our texts (cf. 16, 29, 33, 34, 107, 137, 159, 181, and esp. 128 for mention of the mother); there are 22 public mass burials of soldiers and sixteen private epitaphs of men killed in battle; Pfohl 5, 10, 23, 148, cf. 178 refer to death at sea, and Pfohl 53, 114, 151, cf. 106, 127, 128, to death abroad. As neither bones nor ashes were found in Menekrates' tomb, presumably his body was not recovered, an additional ground for distress. For other aspects of our Corinthian-Korkyrean epitaphs see Raubitschek 6–8, 16–17, cf. 29–30, 32, Gentili 65–66.

The use of tomb and epitaph to make a social and political statement is most obvious in public burials of soldiers and politicians, like Menekrates, but at Sparta and Athens, at least, it can be clearly traced in the private monuments as well.¹⁰ At Sparta there was said to be a Lycurgan law which forbade the inscribing of the name of the deceased upon his gravestone, except in the case of priestesses and of priests killed in battle. Various other measures were also established to check extravagance in private mourning.¹¹ As the archaeological evidence for Spartan funerary practices remains slender, and it is regularly uncertain whether a given monument belonged to a full Spartiate family or not, it cannot be definitely asserted when, if ever, these measures were effectively in force. Yet the few known archaic and classical Laconian tombstones bear the curt announcement "So-and-so," with sometimes the addition "in war," "in childbirth," or "priest." There is no sure sign, either, after 550, of any elaboration in the monuments.¹² It is not unreasonable to suppose that Plutarch's Lycurgan rule was observed, and accordingly there are *a priori* grounds to believe, what also appears plausible from detailed examination, that Pfohl's alleged verse epitaphs from early Sparta are chimerical.¹³ Spartans of the best period were not allowed

¹⁰For public burial of political figures see Pfohl 88, 106, 155 (?); cf. 167, 168, 186.

¹¹Plutarch, *Lyc.* 27. In *Mor.* 238D Plutarch says that only those who died in battle might have their names on their tombs. The fuller version in the life of Lykourgos is clearly more reliable, in view of Herodotos 9.85, where the Spartans after the battle of Plataia are said to have buried the priests separately from the other Spartiates and the only names given are those of four fallen priests. W. den Boer's defence of the manuscript readings of Herodotos and Plutarch, *Laconian Studies* (Amsterdam 1954) 288–300, is compelling, despite the objections of some reviewers, cf. J. Pouilloux, *AntCl* 24 (1955) 234–235, and R. Flacelière, *REA* 57 (1955) 370–373; cf. *REG* 61 (1948) 403–405. C. Leroy, "Λακονικά," *BCH* 85 (1961) 206–235, 228 ff., holds that Lakonian epitaphs with *ἱεροί* and *ἱεραί* are all late and result from Asiatic influence (*IG* 5.1.1338, *ἡ[α]ρὸς* | *Ἀγελήπολις*, fifth century, not withstanding). But *IG* 5.1.1329, — | *ἡαρεὺς* | [— —] OΣ from the fifth century confirms Herodotos; there were of course *ἱερεῖς* in fifth-century Sparta, they received special treatment in funerary matters, and there is no need to emend Plutarch, as if some scribe could have written *τῶν ἱερῶν* for *ἐν λέχῳ*. *IG* 5.1.713 and 714 do have *ἐν λέχῳ*, but Lykourgos' rule as quoted determines only who may have epitaphs, not what they may be, and the women may in any case not be full Spartiates. It is possible, but no more, that Plutarch's text should be made smoother by the addition of *ἐν λέχῳ* thus: *πλὴν ἀνδρὸς ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ γυναικὸς (ἐν λέχῳ) τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποθανόντων*.

¹²See Chr. Chrestos, "Σπαρτιατικοὶ ἀρχαικοὶ τάφοι . . ." *ArchDelt* 19 (1964, appeared 1965) 123–163, and "Ὁ νέος ἀμφορεύς . . ." *ib.* 164–265 for large relief amphorae as Spartan grave markers from ca. 625–550. M. Andronikos, "Λακονικά ἀνάγλυφα," *Peloponnesiaka* 1 (1956) 253–313, makes a strong, if uneven, case against regarding the series of Laconian "hero" reliefs of a man and a woman seated with a kantharos, a fruit, and a snake as representations of the heroized dead, and prefers to see them as religious dedications.

¹³*IG* 5.1 includes three alleged sepulchral epigrams, 720–722. 720, Pfohl 161, should

such ostentation of private mourning. The austerity of their graves was its own announcement.

Nowhere, by contrast, is the elegant and assertive character of the private grave epigram more easily observed than in Peisistratid Athens, where almost all of the known examples are inscribed on marble bases for statues or for decorated *stelai*.¹⁴ Their connexion with the work of art as a whole is close. Miss Jeffery has attributed many of them to a few stone-cutters presumably identical with the monumental masons and sculptors who served the aristocracy in such matters, and Austin suggests that the *stoichedon* style of lettering was introduced by these craftsmen specifically for the epigrams so that they should be in keeping with their setting.¹⁵ Sculptors rather than mourners, certainly, were sometimes responsible for the composition of the verse itself, as the praises of the sculptor Phaidimos in Pfohl 59 and 62 show. It is interesting that the only obvious local peculiarity of phrasing in Pfohl's collection appears among these Attic texts: ἀγαθοῦ καὶ σώφρονος ἀνδρός and σωφροσύνης ἔνεκεν ἢ δ' ἀρετῆς occur in Pfohl 27, 35, 63, 48; cf. 36, 37. Is it coincidence that three, 35, 37, and 63, are associated with the sculptor Aristion?¹⁶ In any case, whether Aristion himself was responsible or not, the vogue of the elaborated concept involved in the qualification of *arete* by *sophrosyne* belongs specifically to the Athenian rich from the time of the Peisistratid tyranny. Miss North, in her study of *sophrosyne*, comments on this group of epigrams as showing a modification of heroic

not be sepulchral (see *Additional Note*.) 721 seems to me, as evidently to Pfohl and to Peek in *GV*, too fragmentary for one to be sure of its nature, though Andronikos, *op. cit.* (above n. 12) 276–279, seems to accept it as a genuine but unique archaic Spartan sepulchral epigram. 722 would seem to me the most likely candidate, but Andronikos considers it too fragmentary, and Pfohl, and *GV*, omit it. Under the circumstances, Pfohl's inclusion of *Anth. Pal.* 7.177 as his 162 is implausible; there probably were no early inscribed verse epitaphs in Lakonia.

¹⁴The importance of the monument as manifesto is made plain by the repeated stress on its position in the public eye, most commonly expressed through a reference to its being on a road (Pfohl 27, 32, 64, 116, 164, 180) or in an address to the passer-by (Pfohl 7, 24, 32, 35, 47, 55, 72, 81, 122, 128, 133, 137, 140, 151, 192) or by a claim to inform the world (Pfohl 6, 24, 30, 128, 156; cf. 21, 80, 109).

¹⁵Miss Jeffery, *BSA* 57. To her material should now be added Pfohl 28, 29, 36, 45–48, *ArchDelt* 20 (1965) B I (appeared 1967) p. 86, *ArchDelt* 23 (1968) 70–76. Pfohl 46 and *ArchDelt* 20 B I p. 86 are signed by the sculptor Aristokles already known from Pfohl 39 and 66. For the aesthetic side of Greek inscriptions see R. P. Austin, *The Stoichedon Style in Greek Inscriptions* (Oxford 1938) 16, and A. G. Woodhead, *The Study of Greek Inscriptions* (Cambridge 1959) ch. 8., also Miss Guarducci 447–451.

¹⁶The links are not all certain, but have seemed attractive, cf. Karousos, *Katalog II A* 12–14, Miss Jeffery *BSA* 57, nos. 8, 9, 49; for sculptor's verse cf. also on nos. 33 and 57, and A. E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949) 426, 430, 431 (a trifle extreme). The inscribed epigrams seem to have influenced Simonides, *Anth. Pal.* 7.513.3–4.

ideals appropriate to the growing *polis*.¹⁷ This modification was announced with particular appropriateness by those noble families that were on sufficiently good terms with the tyrants (whether initial supporters of Peisistratos, foreign allies, or reconciled opponents) to erect elegant monuments for their dead at the gates of the capital.

Miss White points out that it is tempting to associate the appearance of the new concept with the simplification that occurs in Athenian private monuments of various types from the 530's on. The shift from grave *stelai* with sphinx capitals to the smaller type with the palmette has been documented by Miss Richter. Buschor showed that the latter was native to Ionia, particularly Samos, and one thinks of the Samians Aischros, Antistasios, and perhaps Lampito who had funerary monuments in Peisistratid Athens, as well as more general signs of cultural contact like the fetching of Anacreon from Samos by Hipparchos.¹⁸ Boardman establishes that Attic clay funerary monuments underwent a similarly striking change about the same time, and he and Miss Richter connect these developments with the law curbing extravagance in funeral monuments passed at a date somewhat after Solon (*post aliquanto*, Cicero, *Leg.* 2.26.64, on the authority of Demetrios of Phaleron).

Yet the phenomenon was not confined to sepulchral monuments. Miss Harrison remarks of the Attic dedicatory *korai* of the period that "their change-over to Ionic dress, the great increase in their number, and the more frequent occurrence of smaller, cheaper examples all find parallels to some extent in the changes in the type of gravestone."¹⁹ She suggests

¹⁷Miss H. North, *Sophrosyne* (Ithaca 1966) 13-15. Miss North tries to explain why *sophrosyne* is "not just the most Hellenic virtue, but the most Attic as well." Yet she holds the orthodox view that the virtue later to be named *sophrosyne* is present in the moral thinking of Homer and Hesiod and the lyric poets. When the word itself, rare in our Homer (*Iliad* 21.462, *Odyssey* 23.11-13, 30, 4.158, *Hymns* 7.49) and absent from Hesiod and Solon, becomes common about the middle of the sixth century, it shows no particular regional affinities. G. Fatouros, *Index Verborum zur Frühgriechischen Lyrik* (Heidelberg 1966) lists the root as occurring in the Attic scolia, Semonides, Theognis (fourteen times), Simonides, Pindar, Hipponax, Phokylides, and Bacchylides. In short, neither idea nor word has especially Athenian origins. Indeed the three answers which Miss North cites for the problem of Athens' alleged peculiar receptivity to *sophrosyne* are quite unsatisfactory on analysis; namely, the rise of a mercantile middle class, a linking of tyranny with *hybris* as undesirables, and the conscious blending of Doric and Ionic.

¹⁸See Miss G. M. A. Richter, *The Archaic Gravestones of Attica* (London 1961) esp. 2-3, 37-39, E. Buschor, "Altsamische Grabstelen," *AthMitt* 58 (1933) 22-46 esp. 41-42, Karousos, *Katalog II A* 27, B 7 (= *IG* 1² 1005), C 6 (= *IG* 1² 978), [Plato] *Hipparchus* 228. E. Kunze, "Ionische Kleinmeister," *AthMitt* 59 (1934) 81-122 argues for the Samian origin of the Attic "Little Master Cups," and cf. J. P. Barron, *The Silver Coins of Samos* (London 1966) 35 for generally close relations at the time.

¹⁹Miss E. B. Harrison, "Archaic Gravestones from the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 25 (1956) 25-45, esp. 43-45.

that if Peisistratos' supporters, families of the second rank and even foreigners, could set their monuments up in the Kerameikos, display there lost much of its aristocratic significance. Why these men themselves avoided great display she does not say. The problem is more general, and only the vaguest of explanations is really possible. Instead of a few outstanding pieces, representing a comparatively narrow and proud nobility, we find under the tyranny both more and humbler monuments, the product of an age when a wider circle of families could lay claim to importance, and when excessive pretensions accordingly seemed out of place.

Not all sepulchral monuments, indeed, seem to have been affected by the simplifying trend. Handsome life-size *kouroi* actually become commoner, and at least four of our texts praising moderation are in fact inscribed on bases for these elegant memorials, Pfohl 27, 35, 37, 48. Special explanations can to some extent be found. Partly, no doubt, the statues seemed to preserve the dead in a way which was important to the mourners' religious and personal feelings; cf. Karousos 29–31. *Stelai* could be simplified but statues could not easily be abolished. Partly, too, perhaps, a statue seemed to be a more austere, a more manly monument. But to some extent mere fashion was surely involved. The funeral monuments of the Peisistratids themselves have naturally not survived, but one would expect them to have been influential. In general, we may suppose, the tyrants preferred what did not remind one too closely of Athenian nobles' practice in the bad old days, preferred the new, the Ionian, the moderate; but in particular their taste ran to statues. There was a positive as well as a negative side to the change. Like the epigrams, the monuments point to a complex shifting of values.

What then of Cicero's law? The next clause regulates speeches at state funerals. As Miss White observes, this sounds like part of the rider to the *patrios nomos* of public burial of the war dead in the Kerameikos mentioned in Thucydides, 2.35.1. Karousos is surely right in arguing that the democratic tenor of the clause dates it after the tyranny, while recent scholarship has found it possible to believe that Thucydides was right in dating the *patrios nomos* before Marathon.²⁰ Thus the rider, though not earlier than 510, need not be much later. And there is a large change in private sepulchral monuments of all sorts in Attica *ca.* 500—they virtually disappear until the Peloponnesian War. The law, then, will be one of the earliest enactments of the Kleisthenic democracy,

²⁰It would be later than 465 B.C. on the argument of F. Jacoby, "*Patrios Nomos*: State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetery in the Kerameikos," *JHS* 64 (1944) 37–66; but cf. the doubts of A. W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* 2 (Oxford 1956) 94–98, now re-enforced by D. Bradeen, "The Athenian Casualty Lists," *CQ* 19 (1969) 145–159 Appendix I, and N. Hammond, *ib.* 118 and 142.

re-enforcing the new *nomos* of state burial of war dead which may even have been instituted to honour those who fell in liberating Athens. A new-found civic pride and patriotic self-abnegation persuaded Athenians individually to go even farther than the law required, and voluntarily to do without all ostentation of private mourning in their grave monuments.

This study of what Gentili, p. 55, well calls the "scopo . . . 'publicitario'" of prominent archaic grave monuments and their epigrams has led us away from Pfohl's texts into dangerously speculative regions. It is perhaps no cause for confidence that a whole area of traditional discussion has been passed over in silence here. Among other examinations of verse epitaphs from the point of view of literary history one may mention the attempts of Raubitschek and Gentili to relate the early material from Corinth and Korkyra (presented above) to Homer and other epics both in themes and in diction. Such analysis of broad regional trends as has been done in this paper is obviously to be complemented by finer work on individual texts. At least it may not be too optimistic to hope that the steady increase of material will make generalizations about the relation of various early Greek grave epigrams to the societies that produced them less insecure.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

ADDITIONAL NOTE

It seems necessary for this paper, and possibly useful to users of Pfohl, to make a list of desirable exclusions from and inclusions in his collection. In view of my unavoidably critical tone regarding details, it should be said that in general the book is thorough, accurate, and useful.

First, as to exclusions. Nothing suggests that the three fragments in Pfohl's Addenda are either sepulchral or metrical, nor that 43 is. 185 and 161 are probably not sepulchral; cf. Miss Jeffery 193-194.31, 352.36. 39, 66, 69, 71, 131, 166, 172 are each a few unpoetic words. More doubtful are 13, 15, 40, 74, 79, 97, 113, 152. Of these 13, 74, 79, 113, 152 were available to and omitted by the editors of *Epigrammata*, I think rightly. 40 they printed (their 161) as "intermediate between verse and prose" (cf. Gentili; p. 78, n. 4). 15, the recently discovered Glaukos inscription, is generally regarded as prose; cf. R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (Oxford 1969) no. 3 and Miss Guarducci 162-164 with references. Would 97 be iambs or a heading plus a hexameter? The doubt suggests that it is neither. Finally, the proof that 57 and 169 are prose appears in the text pp. 96. This is a conservative list; it does not touch any inscription that has a claim to be verse, however hypermetrical or

irregular or obscure. It may be noted that a verse inscription tends to accompany other elegances in the monument; 43 and 71, which are on limestone, not marble, and unaccompanied by sculptured or painted decoration or evidence for it, should have been expected to be prose. Pfohl 162 is to be excluded for reasons given in n. 13. Excluded, then, are 13, 15, 39, 40, 43, 57, 66, 69, 71, 74, 79, 97, 113, 131, 152, 161, 162, 166, 169, 172, 185, and 26 A, 96 A, 179 A.

As to inclusions, some readers may regret the absence of the "Marathon epigrams" and other poems for war memorials other than tombs and cenotaphs. There may also be mixed feelings about some of the decisions as to which epigrams from the literary tradition were genuinely early and probably inscribed. A list of the texts from the *Anth. Pal.* and from T. Preger, *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae ex scriptoribus praeter anthologiam collectae* (Leipzig 1891), which Pfohl considered and rejected would have been a welcome addition. Of epigraphical texts it is odd to omit *Epigrammata* 33:

Σᾶμα τόξ' Ἰδαμενεὺς ποίησα, ἵνα κλέος εἶη
Ζεὺ(δ) δέ νιν ὅστις πημαῖνοι λειώλῃ θείῃ.

This couplet is by far the earliest of its type; cf. R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, Illinois, 1942 and 1962) 109. The title "Greek Poems on Stone" has unfortunately excluded at least two late archaic Athenian fragments on clay:

--]νος σῆμα τόδ' ἐστὶ Ἀρείου,

Boardman 11, and

ἀνδρὸς ἀπ[οφθιμ]ένοιο ῥάκ[ος] κα[κ]ὸν [ἐν]θάδε κείμε[ι],

Karousos 33-34, n. 62. At least three new verse epitaphs have already been published since Pfohl: from Attica, *ArchDelt* 20 (1965) B I Chronika (appeared 1967) p. 86

←
Ὅφσιος : ἡὲς ἀλόχο : Ἀφσυνθιῇ ἡὲ δὲ |θυγατρὸς
Οἰάνθης : θέκεν μνῆμα : |καταφθιμένους :
καὶ τόδε Ἀριστοκλέους.

from Boiotia, St. Koumanoudes, "Ἐπίγραμμα ἐξ Κωπῶν," *ArchAnAth* 2 (1969) 80 ff.:

-- μ' ἐγ]ραφσεν . ἐπ' Ἀσῶπιδι δὲ δαμασθῆς [--
παῖσιν θ]ρῆνον ἔθηκεα . ἡὲ τόδ' ἐπέστ[ησεν] --
--]οῖσα τὸν ἡνιὸν Καφί[σ] --

(I owe this reference to C. P. Jones. The editor identifies the battle at the Asopos as that of Oinophyta, but the letter forms make Plataia very possible.).

from Selinous, M. Piraino, "Quattro Iscrizione Greche del Museo di Palermo," *Kokalos* 12 (1966) 200–206, p. 202.3:

--- αι δ' οἴκτιρε[---

--- ἄμ]μορον ἡ[---

--- κ]ρυβες [---

Three further possible additions fall on the lower boundary of our period: the new Archilochos epigram (Raubitschek 15–16, cf. 35–36); and *Arch Delt* 23 (1968) A 70–76 and B 1 *Chronika* p. 95. Especially with Attic texts, there would be much to be said for a division between those certainly before, say, 410 and the rest, excluding ones from the turn of the century.